

Appl. No. 10/671,213
Amdt. Dated: March 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: January 26, 2005

Docket No. CE11342W
Customer No. 23330

REMARKS

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-25 remain in the application. The actions taken are in the interest of expediting prosecution and with no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. Moreover, the amendment or cancellation of claims herein is without prejudice to pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The specification is objected to because supposedly no reference to FIG.5 is found in the specification. "Brief Description of the Drawings" was amended to include a reference to FIG.5. Further, FIG.5 is already discussed in the specification beginning on page 8, line 11.

The Office Action objected to the titled stating that it was not descriptive. Applicant traverses this objection as "TEMPORARY BLOCK FLOW ALLOCATION METHOD" is descriptive. Furthermore, 37 CFR § 1.51(iv) and 37 CFR 1.72(a) simply requires a title. It does not require a title that describes every possible embodiment of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submit that the title complies with the Code of Federal Regulations.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the specification mentions a numeral "21," while no "21" is shown in the drawings. The reference numeral "21" was a typographical error and has been corrected to "20," rendering this rejection moot.

U.S.C. §112 second paragraph

Claims 21 is rejected under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not having proper antecedent basis. Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to place each element in proper antecedent basis, rendering this rejection moot.

Appl. No. 10/671,213
Amdt. Dated: March 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: January 26, 2005

Docket No. CE11342W
Customer No. 23330

Allowable Subject Matter

It was stated in the office action that claims 1-20 were allowed. It was further stated in the Office action that claims 21-25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection of claim 21. Claims 21 and 22 have been rewritten to overcome the rejection, thereby making claims 21-25 allowable as well.

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117, Motorola, Inc..

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 23330

By: 

Attorney of Record: Kevin D. Wills
Reg. No.: 43,993

Telephone: 602-952-4399
Fax No.: 602-952-4376